

# Chapter 5

## Federal Facility Cleanups

Federal departments and agencies manage a variety of industrial activities at more than 27,000 installations. Due to the nature of such activities, whether they are federally or privately managed, federal installations may be contaminated with hazardous substances and therefore subject to CERCLA requirements. Although federal facilities comprise only a small percentage of the community regulated under CERCLA, many federal facilities are larger and more complex than their private industrial counterparts and are likely to host continuing activities. Because of their size and complexity and the existence of ongoing activities, compliance with environmental statutes may present unique management issues for federal facilities.

---

### 5.1 The Federal Facilities Program

---

CERCLA Section 120(a) requires that federal facilities comply with CERCLA requirements to the same extent as private facilities. Executive Order 12580 delegates the President's authority under CERCLA to federal departments and agencies, making them responsible for cleanup activities at their facilities. At federal facilities that are National Priorities List (NPL) sites, which are sites having the highest priority for remediation under Superfund, CERCLA mandates that cleanups be conducted under interagency agreements (IAGs) between EPA and relevant federal agencies. States are often a party to these agreements as well. The federal facility agreement (FFA) is another type of agreement that may govern cleanup terms at a federal facility. To ensure federal facility compliance with CERCLA requirements, EPA provides technical advice and assistance and may take enforcement action when appropriate.

In addition to CERCLA, there is a range of authority and enforcement tools under state statutes that apply to non-NPL federal facility sites. Indian tribes also may be involved in federal agency compliance with environmental regulations when acting as either lead or support agencies for Superfund response actions.

---

#### 5.1.1 Federal Facility Responsibilities Under CERCLA

---

Federal departments and agencies are responsible for identifying and addressing hazardous waste sites at the facilities that they own or operate. They are required under CERCLA to comply with all provisions of federal environmental statutes and regulations and all applicable state and local requirements during site cleanup.

---

#### 5.1.2 EPA's Oversight Role

---

EPA oversees federal facility cleanup activities and provides cleanup assistance to federal agencies. EPA's responsibilities include:

- listing sites on the NPL,
- negotiating IAGs,
- promoting community involvement through site-specific advisory boards and restoration advisory boards,
- selecting or assisting in the determination of cleanup remedies,
- concurring with cleanup remedies,

- providing technical advice and assistance,
- overseeing cleanup activities,
- reviewing federal agency pollution abatement plans, and
- resolving disputes regarding noncompliance.

To fulfill these responsibilities, EPA relies on personnel from Headquarters, Regional offices, and states. This includes personnel from the Federal Facilities Enforcement Office (FFEO) in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) and the Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office (FFRRO) in the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

To track the status of a federal facility, EPA uses several information systems. The Facility Index System provides an inventory of federal facilities subject to environmental regulations. Through the CERCLA Information System (CERCLIS), EPA maintains a comprehensive list of all reported potentially hazardous waste sites, including federal facility sites. CERCLIS also contains cleanup project schedules and achievements for federal facility sites. A list of federal facility sites potentially contaminated with hazardous waste, which is required by CERCLA Section 120(c), is made available to the public through the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket and through routine docket updates published in the *Federal Register*.

### **5.1.3 The Roles of States and Indian Tribes**

Under the provisions of CERCLA Section 120(f), state and local governments are encouraged to participate in planning and selecting remedial actions to be taken at federal facility NPL sites within their jurisdiction. State and local government participation includes, but is not limited to, reviewing site information and developing studies, reports, and action plans for the site. EPA encourages states to become signatories to the IAGs that federal agencies must execute with EPA under CERCLA Section 120(e)(2). State participation in the CERCLA cleanup process is carried out under the provisions of CERCLA Section 121.

Cleanups at federal facility sites not listed on the NPL are carried out by the federal agency that owns or operates the site, often under state or federal oversight. Federal agencies use the CERCLA cleanup process outlined in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan at these sites. In addition to CERCLA, these cleanups are subject to state laws regarding response actions. A state's role at a non-NPL federal facility site, therefore, will be determined both by that state's cleanup laws and CERCLA.

CERCLA Section 126 mandates that federally recognized Indian tribes be afforded substantially the same treatment as states with regard to most CERCLA provisions. Thus, the role of a qualifying Indian tribe in a federal facility cleanup would be substantially similar to that of a state. To qualify, a tribe must be federally recognized; have a tribal governing body that is currently performing governmental functions to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the affected population; and have jurisdiction over a site.

## **5.2 Fiscal Year 1996 Progress**

FFEO and FFRRO, in conjunction with other EPA Headquarters offices, Regional offices, and states, ensure federal department and agency compliance with CERCLA and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act requirements. Progress in achieving federal facility compliance may be measured by the status of federal facility sites on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket and on the NPL, and by the execution of IAGs for federal facility sites.

### **5.2.1 Status of Facilities on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket**

Federal facilities where hazardous waste is managed or from which hazardous substances have been released are identified on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket. The docket was established under CERCLA Section 120(c) and functions as an important record in the Superfund federal facilities program. Information submitted to EPA on identified facilities is compiled and

maintained in the docket and then made available to the public.

The initial federal agency docket was published in the *Federal Register* on February 12, 1988. At that time, 1,095 federal facilities were listed on the docket. Although a docket update was not issued in FY96, the April 11, 1995, docket update listed a total of 2,070 facilities. Of this total, the Department of Defense (DoD) owned or operated 933 (45 percent) of the facilities and the Department of the Interior (DOI) owned or operated 434 (21 percent). The remainder were distributed among 18 other federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

---

### **5.2.2 Status of Federal Facilities on the NPL**

To distinguish the increasing number of federal facility NPL sites from non-federal NPL sites, NPL updates list federal facility sites separately from non-federal sites. NPL updates also contain language that clarifies the roles of EPA and other federal departments and agencies with regard to federal facility sites. Consistent with Executive Order 12580 and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, EPA is typically not the lead agency for federal facility sites on the NPL; federal agencies are usually lead agencies for their own facilities. EPA is, however, responsible for overseeing federal facility compliance with CERCLA.

At the end of FY96, there were 164 federal facility sites proposed to or listed on the NPL.

Federal departments and agencies made substantial progress during FY96 toward cleaning up federal facility NPL sites. Activity at federal facility NPL sites during the year included the start of approximately 57 remedial investigation/ feasibility studies (RI/FSs), 58 remedial designs (RDs), 41 removals, and 70 remedial actions (RAs). Also, 76 records of decision (RODs) were signed, and a total of nine sites have achieved construction completion. Ongoing activities at the end of FY96 included 459 RI/FSs, 71 RDs, and 151 RAs.

---

### **5.2.3 Interagency Agreements Under CERCLA Section 120**

---

IAGs are the cornerstone of the enforcement program for federal facility NPL sites. They are enforceable documents and contain, among other things, a description of remedy selection alternatives, schedules of cleanup activities, and provisions for dispute resolution. During FY96, one CERCLA IAG was executed to accomplish hazardous waste cleanup at federal facility NPL sites. Of the 160 final federal facility sites listed on the NPL, 100 were covered by enforceable agreements by the end of the fiscal year.

IAGs between EPA and each responsible federal department or agency, to which states may be signatories, address some or all of the phases of remedial activity (RI/FS, RD, RA, operation and maintenance) to be undertaken at a federal facility NPL site. IAGs formalize the schedule and procedures for submission and review of documents and include a time line for remedial activities in accordance with the requirements of CERCLA Section 120(e). They also must comply with the public involvement requirements of CERCLA Section 117.

Included in IAG provisions are mechanisms for resolving disputes between the signatories. EPA can also assess stipulated penalties for noncompliance with the terms of IAGs. The agreements are enforceable by the states, and citizens may seek to enforce them through civil suits. Penalties may be imposed by the courts against federal departments and agencies in successful suits brought by states or citizens for failure to comply with IAGs.

---

### **5.3 Federal Facility Initiatives**

---

The growing awareness of environmental contamination at federal facilities has increased the public demand for facility cleanup. To address this demand, EPA has worked to establish priorities for cleanup programs and thereby maximize the cleanups that can be accomplished with the limited resources available. EPA's federal facility offices (FFRRO and FFEO) directed their efforts to cleaning up closing military bases, accelerating cleanups, prioritizing cleanups, addressing issues through interagency

forums, and promoting the use of innovative technologies at federal facility sites.

---

**5.3.1 Military Base Closure**

---

During the fiscal year, DoD, EPA, and States continued to implement the Fast Track Cleanup Program for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Act. EPA's program activities were directed at working with DoD and the states to achieve President Clinton's goal of "making property environmentally acceptable for transfer, while protecting human health and the environment" at closing or realigning installations. In FY 1996, EPA and DoD worked together to determine what BRAC '95 installations should be included on the "Fast Track Cleanup" list and then develop an appropriate workload assessment of what would be necessary to achieve installation cleanup and reuse. Under the revised Memorandum of Agreement, EPA participated on BRAC Cleanup Teams (BCTs) at 110 BRAC 1, 2, 3, and 4 installations. Of these installations, 32 were NPL sites, and 78 were non-NPL.

DoD, EPA, and State regulators have developed BCTs to deal with the complex environmental problems at closing and realigning bases. BCTs work to expedite and integrate cleanup with potential reuse options.

As part of this effort, EPA and state regulators assemble technical and legal experts to support the BCTs. This leads to real-time decision making, reduction in documents, and identification of innovative ways to accomplish faster cleanup. In the FY95 *Defense Environmental Response Task Force Report*, EPA reported via an initial survey, that the first two years of this creative approach eliminated over 80 years of project work and avoided over \$100 million in costs. In FY96, EPA's second survey showed an additional savings of 70 years of project work and avoided over \$50 million in costs.

---

**5.3.2 National Risk-Based Priority Setting**

---

During FY96, FFRRO developed a draft guidance to address the role of risk and other factors, including cost, community concerns, environmental justice, and cultural considerations, in setting priorities for

cleanup at federal facility sites. The guidance also discusses DoD and DOE approaches to evaluating risks at sites, and the appropriate role of stakeholders in the process of setting priorities. Federal agencies and states were provided with the opportunity to comment on the draft guidance. Regions began to implement the risk-based priority setting concept, including Regions 3, 9, and 10, which had success setting risk-based priorities at Navy Superfund sites.

---

**5.3.3 Interagency Forums**

---

Through its participation in interagency organizations, EPA made significant progress in addressing concerns associated with federal facility cleanup.

**Federal Facilities Environmental Restoration Dialogue Committee**

The Federal Facilities Environmental Restoration Dialogue Committee (FFERDC), established in 1992 as an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, provided a forum for developing consensus policy recommendations aimed at improving the process by which federal facility environmental cleanup decisions are made. Committee members included individuals from EPA, U.S. Department of Agriculture, DOI, DOE, DoD, the National Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR); state, tribal and local governments; and numerous other nationally, regionally and locally based environmental, community, environmental justice, Native American and labor organizations. In April 1996, FFERDC released its final report, *Consensus Principles and Recommendations for Improving Federal Facilities Cleanup*. The report contained fourteen principles that should be the basis for making federal facility cleanup decisions.

**Defense Environmental Restoration Task Force**

EPA continued to participate in the Defense Environmental Restoration Task Force (DERTF). The goals of DERTF are to examine environmental issues associated with the cleanup and reuse of closing military installations and to identify and recommend ways to expedite and improve environmental response

actions at military installations scheduled to be closed. DERTF conducted three meetings in FY96, and provided the public the opportunity to participate and comment on its activities along with cleanup and reuse issues at closing military installations. The Future Land Use Working Group addresses the effectiveness of existing DoD guidance on full disclosure and understanding of the implications of restricted future land use.

### **BRAC Cleanup Teams**

EPA conducted BCT member training for BCTs, which were established in coordination with DoD and the states at all major installations scheduled for closure. EPA and DoD prepared and conducted bottom-up reviews of BRAC cleanup plans for closing installations, established restoration advisory boards (RABs) at closing installations, provided RAB training workshops, and determined, by consensus, the suitability of property to transfer or lease for reuse. As mandated by the Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act, EPA reviewed, and where appropriate, concurred in the identification of uncontaminated parcels of property that are part of an NPL site.

In addition, EPA HQ developed training entitled "RCRA/CERCLA 101 Training" for the new BCT's formed to handle the BRAC '95 installations (a.k.a. BRAC 4). In addition, EPA issued the "Fast Track Cleanup Guidance," the Landfill policy, the "Operating Properly and Successfully" policy, and other BRAC related guidances to assist BCTs with their field work and the reuse acceleration.

In FY 1996, 146 Full Time Equivalent reimbursable positions were dedicated to supporting the BRAC program. Over 90 percent of the DoD resources were assigned to EPA's Regional offices.

### **RCRA/CERCLA Lead Regulator Workgroup**

Federal facilities are governed by numerous environmental laws, such as CERCLA, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and state laws, with different sources of authority. Multiple authorities with their own cleanup processes and standards may cause duplicative and inefficient use of cleanup resources. To discuss streamlining the application of multiple cleanup laws and overlapping

authorities at a federal facility site, FFRRO hosted a workgroup composed of representatives from EPA Regions, federal agencies, and state agencies. The workgroup began developing guidance to establish clearly defined roles for various regulators at federal facilities, highlighting the concept of a predominant or "lead" regulator.

### **Environmental Management Advisory Board**

With DOE, EPA participated in the Department's Environmental Management Advisory Board. The board consists of representatives from industry, academia, and the environmental community. It provides information, advice, and recommendations on issues confronting the national environmental management program. These issues include cleanup criteria and risk assessment, land use, priority setting, management effectiveness, cost-versus-benefit analyses, and strategies for determining the future national configuration of waste management and disposal facilities.

---

## **5.4 CERCLA Implementation at EPA Facilities**

---

Of the 2,070 sites on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket at the end of FY96, 25 were EPA-owned or operated. Of these EPA-owned or operated sites, one was listed on the NPL. As required by CERCLA Section 120(e)(5), a report on cleanup progress at these 25 facilities is provided below.

---

### **5.4.1 Requirements of CERCLA Section 120(e)(5)**

---

CERCLA Section 120(e)(5) requires an annual report to Congress from each federal department, agency, or instrumentality on its progress in implementing Superfund at its facilities. Specifically, the annual report to Congress is to include, but need not be limited to, the following items:

- Section 120(e)(5)(A): A report on the progress in reaching IAGs under CERCLA Section 120(e)(2);
- Section 120(e)(5)(B): The specific cost estimates and budgetary proposals involved in each IAG;
- Section 120(e)(5)(C): A brief summary of the public comments regarding each proposed IAG;
- Section 120(e)(5)(D): A description of the instances in which no agreement (IAG) was reached;
- Section 120(e)(5)(E): A progress report on conducting RI/FSs required by CERCLA Section 120(e)(1) at NPL sites;
- Section 120(e)(5)(F): A progress report on remedial activities at sites listed on the NPL; and
- Section 120(e)(5)(G): A progress report on response activities at facilities that are not listed on the NPL.

CERCLA also requires that the annual report contain a detailed description, by state, of the status of each facility subject to Section 120(e)(5). The status report must include a description of the hazards presented by each facility, plans and schedules for initiating and completing response actions, enforcement status (where applicable), and an explanation of any postponement or failure to complete response actions. EPA gives high priority to maintaining compliance with CERCLA requirements at its own facilities. To ensure concurrence with all environmental statutes, EPA uses its environmental compliance program to heighten regulatory awareness, identify potential compliance violations, and coordinate appropriate corrective action schedules at its laboratories and other research facilities.

---

#### **5.4.2 Progress in Cleaning Up EPA Facilities Subject to Section 120 of CERCLA**

---

At the end of FY96, the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket listed 25 EPA-owned or operated facilities, including one that has been listed on the NPL (the Old Navy Dump/Manchester NPL site in Washington). Two of the sites (the Brunswick Facility in Brunswick,

Georgia; and the Philadelphia Site in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) listed previously and four of the sites (the Bay City CERT Site in Bay City, Michigan; the Electro Voice Site in Buchanan, Michigan; the Ottati & Goss Site in Kingston, New Hampshire; and Fine Petroleum in Norfolk, Virginia) listed in FY95 may have been listed on the docket in error. EPA is currently investigating those listings. EPA has evaluated and, as appropriate, undertaken response activities at the 25 EPA sites on the docket for which it is responsible, including the site on the NPL. As required by CERCLA Section 120(e)(5), Exhibit 5.4-1 provides the status, by state, of EPA-owned or operated sites and identifies the types of problems and progress of activities at each site. EPA facilities that have undergone significant response activities in FY96 are discussed in detail below. As required for EPA-owned or operated NPL sites, the information presented below for the Old Navy Dump/Manchester NPL Site provides a report on progress in meeting CERCLA Section 120 requirements for reaching IAGs, conducting RI/FSs, and providing information on the status of remedial activities. For other EPA-owned or operated sites on the docket, the information presented below provides a report on progress in conducting response activities at the facilities.

#### **National Air and Radiation Environmental Laboratory, Alabama**

EPA's air and radiation laboratory formerly operated at a site near its current location at Gunter Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama. During operations at the original site, waste solvents, including xylene and benzene, were discharged into a pit adjacent to the laboratory building. The releases were identified by EPA's internal auditing program. The site was remediated initially by removing the accessible contaminated soil and replacing it with uncontaminated soil. Then EPA, in conjunction with the Underground Injection Control Program of the Alabama Department of Environmental Management, determined the extent of the remaining contamination and developed an appropriate mitigation program. EPA is monitoring the ground-water wells on the property regularly and implemented a program to pump ground water from

**Exhibit 5.4-1**  
**Status of EPA Facilities on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket<sup>1</sup>**

State	EPA Facility	Known or Suspected Problems	Project Status
AL	National Air and Radiation Environment Laboratory (formerly known as the Eastern Environmental Radiation Facility)	Soil and groundwater contamination	No further remedial action required
MA	New England Regional Laboratory	no contamination	Pollution prevention plan continues
MI	Bay City CERT Site	Miscellaneous drums on EPA owned parcels	Site turned over to Bay City
MI	Electro Voice	Electroplating waste contamination	Remedial design completed, soil cleanup efforts performed
NH	Ottati & Goss Superfund Site	Groundwater, soil, and sediment contamination	1st Remedial design completed, FS initiated
NJ	EPA Edison Facilities (formerly known as the Raritan Depot)	No contamination that poses a threat to the environment	Continuing investigations
VA	Fine Petroleum	Decaying containers of hazardous materials	Remedial work completed, site referred to DOJ
WA	Old Navy Dump/Manchester NPL Site (formerly known as the Region 10 Environmental Services Division Laboratory)	Soil and sediment contamination attributable to DoD ownership	Remedial investigation/feasibility study completed

Source: Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket and the Office of Administration and Resource Management.

<sup>1</sup> This list does not include the following 16 EPA facilities where remedial activities have been completed, that have been conditionally exempt from PA requirements, or placed on the docket in error. These facilities include the Andrew W. Breidenback Environmental Research Ctr., Ann Arbor Motor Vehicle Lab., Brunswick Facility, Center Hill Hazardous Waste Engineering Research Lab., Central Region Laboratory-MD, Combustion Research Facility-AR, Corvallis Environmental Research Lab., Houston Laboratory, Mobile Incinerator-Demmry Farm, National Enforcement Investigation Ctr., Philadelphia Site, Region 5 Environmental Services Division Lab., Region 7 Environmental Services Division Lab., Technology Center-NC, Testing and Evaluation Facility-OH, and Washington Headquarters.

the contaminated area. In FY96, EPA received confirmation from the Alabama Department of Environmental Management that the monitoring wells and pumping system could be closed and that no further action was required at the site.

#### **Casmalia Resources, California**

The Casmalia Resources Hazardous Waste Facility operated as a commercial hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facility from 1973 to 1989. During this time period, the facility accepted billions of pounds of waste materials. Subsequently, efforts to close the facility properly and permanently were abandoned by the

owner/operators. In 1992, the State of California requested EPA step in as the lead regulatory agency. EPA has since undertaken emergency response activities while seeking voluntary cleanup by PRPs.

#### **New England Regional Laboratory, Massachusetts**

An underground oil storage tank was replaced at the New England Regional Laboratory in October 1993. During excavation, the cavity left by the old tank filled with water and developed a sheen. The laboratory was given a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit exclusion and allowed to pump the water because tank inspection

and water analysis indicated that no leaks were present and no groundwater contamination occurred. The laboratory continues to improve its environment, safety, and health program with regular audits by the Safety, Health, and Environmental Management Program (SHEMP).

### **Bay City CERT Site, Michigan**

EPA was authorized by Congress to purchase property for the construction of a Center for Ecological Research and Training (CERT) in Bay City, Michigan. A preliminary site characterization and three subsequent phases of site characterization were performed on the approximately 90 acre (25 parcel) site. Field investigations (Phase II and Phase III) began in FY93 and were ongoing through FY96. Results of the investigations showed that localized areas of the CERT site had been impacted by past onsite and offsite land usage and related activities. Potential environmental liabilities at the site and costs associated with remediation of these liabilities were also identified. Authorization and funding was rescinded in FY94 halting the CERT project. EPA had acquired six of the 25 parcels at that time. During the investigation, miscellaneous drums deposited by unknown parties were discovered on two of the EPA owned parcels. The site was turned over to Bay City in FY96

### **Electro Voice, Michigan**

The Electro Voice site has been occupied by several manufacturing companies since the 1920s. Demolitions refuse was deposited in an onsite natural land depression from the 1920s to the early 1950's. Portions of Electro Voice, Inc.'s facilities have been built upon this fill. Electro Voice built two lagoons for the purpose of disposing electroplating waste in 1952. The lagoons were removed from service in 1962 and a wastewater treatment facility was installed. In 1979, an industrial sewer link broke discharging liquid waste into the north lagoon. Electro Voice responded to this spill by treating and removing the discharge and installing a holding tank to prevent similar incidents. The lagoons were closed and backfilled in 1980. In 1987, the EPA and Electro Voice entered into a Consent Order requiring the company to carry out a feasibility study of site

contamination. The study was completed by the EPA in September of 1991. Final remedies were selected for the lagoon area, onsite groundwater, and dry well area soils. The remedial design was completed in FY96 along with the excavation of contaminated soil and construction of a clay cap.

### **Ottati & Goss Superfund Site, New Hampshire**

The Ottati & Goss Superfund Site was used by several companies and corporations for the purposes of drum reconditioning operations from 1959 until 1980. The site was then used by Ottati & Goss from March 1978 until July 1979 as a hazardous materials processing and storage facility. An RI/FS conducted in 1986 revealed that groundwater under the site was contaminated well above drinking water standards. The investigation also found a significant amount of soil and sediment contaminated above levels protective of human health and the environment. EPA conducted emergency removal actions at the site between December of 1980 and July of 1982. PRPs performed partial soil cleanup remediation at the site in 1989. The remedial design was completed in FY96 and a feasibility study was initiated.

### **EPA Edison Facilities, New Jersey**

The EPA Edison Facilities site was formerly the Raritan Depot, which was owned by DoD and used for munitions testing and storage. In 1963, the General Services Administration (GSA) took possession of the property and, in 1988, transferred approximately 200 acres of the site to EPA. Although residual contamination from past DoD and GSA activities at the facility persists, EPA has not stored, released, or disposed of any hazardous substances on the property. A site inspection was conducted in FY91, following the discovery of a contaminated surface-water impoundment. The investigation resulted in the implementation of interim cleanup actions. Response activities have included spraying a rubble pile containing asbestos with a bituminous sealant; removing the liquid in the surface impoundment, excavating soil, installing a liner, and backfilling the impoundment with clean material; excavating and storing munitions; and removing underground storage tanks. EPA expects



that DoD will pursue additional cleanup work at the site.

### **Fine Petroleum, Virginia**

The Fine Petroleum/Mariner HiTech site has been a paint and paint-related product recycling facility since the late 1960's. Approximately 13,000 containers with capacities ranging from 1 quart to 55 gallons were discovered in varying stages of decay in a field on the approximately 3 acre property. EPA performed a sampling assessment in July 1992 leading to a removal action in 1993 in which 26,330 gallons of paint and paint-related materials were removed. In May 1995, a fire occurred at the sole building on the property which housed numerous containers of hazardous substances. Following the fire, engineer evaluations indicated the warehouse to be structurally unsound. A runoff barrier was erected and air monitoring was conducted around the perimeter of the building's remains. A total of 365, 55-gallon drums of reportable quantity wastes, approximately 1120 cubic yards of non-hazardous demolition debris, and 916 tons of non-hazardous, petroleum-impacted soil was removed during this 1995 event. The site began cost recovery stage in FY96.

### **Old Navy Dump/Manchester NPL Site, Washington**

EPA acquired this former Navy site from DoD in 1970 and used the land to construct an environmental testing laboratory in 1978. The property is also used for two other environmental laboratories run by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Washington State Department of Ecology. The property adjacent to the laboratories had been used by the Navy to conduct firefighting training exercises, maintain metal anti-submarine nets, and serve as a Navy landfill. Investigations of the property history revealed that in the 1940s and 1950s, the Navy had used a lagoon on the property to dispose of metal debris and other waste from the nearby Bremerton Naval Shipyard. Also, chemical residues from the Navy firefighting training school had been allowed to drain into the ground. In FY93, a preliminary assessment and site inspection of the property revealed the presence of hazardous

substances in the soil, sediment, and surface-water run off. In January 1994, EPA proposed the site to the NPL, and in June 1994, EPA listed the site on the NPL.

Because the site is a former Navy site, the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) will provide funding for evaluating and correcting the hazardous conditions. Negotiations for an IAG for site cleanup were initiated in July 1994 and were ongoing as of the end of the fiscal year. Also during the year, the Seattle District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was authorized under the Department of Defense's Environmental Restoration Program for FUDs to perform an RI/FS of the Old Navy Dump/Manchester NPL Site (FUDS Site No. F10WA011900) and to prepare a proposed plan and ROD. The RI/FS was completed in FY96.

This page intentionally left blank